



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,054	01/13/2000	Kenneth Margon	031613.0012	6497
21967	7590	10/23/2003	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			NGUYEN, STEVEN H D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2665		27
DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/482,054	MARGON, KENNETH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven HD Nguyen	2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-61,64-71,74-77,80 and 81 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-61,64-71,74-77,80 and 81 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 6/20/2003, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-19, 24-25, 32-35, 40, 42-46, 50, 55-57, 61, 66, 68-71, 74, 76-77 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi (USP 5682604) in view of Serfaty (USP 5572546).

As claims 1-3, 5-7, 15-19, 24-25, 32-35, 40, 42-46, 50, 55-57, 61, 66, 68-71, 74, 76-77 and 80, Kashi discloses a base station having a transceiver (Fig 2, Ref 10) for providing a forward channel (Fig 7, Ref 200), a remote station (Fig 2, Ref 11) for monitoring “listening or sensing” the forward channel signal and monitoring reserve channel within a clear “free” channel access interval that is assigned to the remote units and in sequential order with at least one other remote (Fig 7, time to sense channel free and col. 1, lines 30-39 and col. 6, lines 7-13) and providing reserve channel signal if it’s clear “free” (Fig 7, Ref 210). See Abstract, col. 1, lines 6 to col. 4, lines 63 and Fig 1-7; a base station (fig 2, ref 10) and a remote station (Fig 2, Ref 11) inherently receive and transmit an encoded signal between them as a data packet (See Fig 4 and col. 4, lines 22-37 as claim 2-3, 40 and 61); a priority and unique address of remote station for receiving the forward information from the central station (See col. 4, line 22-37 as claimed 5-7, 33-35, 56-57, 70-71 and 77); a forward and reserve channel signal is provided during its predetermined interval (See Fig 6 as claimed 19, 46, 73 and 79) and a wireless communication system having frequency (Fig 2 as claimed 24-25, 50, 66, 74 and 80). However, Kashi fails to disclose a method and system for dividing a clear access interval into a plurality of time slot wherein each time slot is assigned to each mobile unit. In the same field of endeavor, Serfaty

discloses a system which including a upstream and downstream channel wherein the downstream channel and sensing time interval which is divided into a plurality of time slots wherein each mobile is assigned a time slot for sensing if the uplink channel is free in order to transmit the reverse signal to the receiving station (See col. 5, lines 9-32).

Since, Kashi suggests that each mobile station has a different time such time slot to sense free channel before transmitting a reverse signal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply a method and system for dividing a sensing interval time into a plurality of time slots wherein each time slot assigned to each mobile unit as disclosed by Serfaty's system and method into Kashi's system and method. The motivation would have been to reduce the collision and improve the throughput of the system.

5. Claims 4, 26-29, 41, 51-52, 67, 75 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi and Serfaty as applied to claims 1, 32, 55, 68-69 and 76 above, and further in view of Kubler (USP 5726984).

As claims 4, 26-29, 41, 51-52, 67, 75 and 81, Kashi and Serfaty do not fully disclose the data packet including a digitized voice and data. Kubler discloses a data packet including digitized voice and data (col. 3, lines 54-64) and a half, full duplex and the signals are transmitted via electrical or optical medium (col. 21, lines 31-53).

Since a packet that includes voice and data is well known and expected in the art at the time of invention was made. Since, both the concept and the advantages of using half and full duplex for transmitting voice and data packet in a wireless and wireline system are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to apply the data packets

including the digitized voice and data for transmitting between the base and remote station as disclosed by Kubler into the system and method of Kashi and Serfaty. The motivation would have been to integrate a wireless network with a wireline network such as Internet and turn the Internet into a reliable telecommunication network.

6. Claims 8-11, 36-37 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi and Serfaty as applied to claims 1, 32 and 55 above, and further in view of Dobbins (USP 5751971).

As claims 8-11, 36-37 and 60, Kashi and Serfaty do not fully disclose an address is broadcast, a semi broadcast, IP. Dobbins discloses a broadcast, group and Internet address (Col. 4, lines 5-65). Since, both the concept and the advantages of using broadcast, group and Internet address in a wireless system is well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to assign an address to a remote unit in order to route the packets in the system.

7. Claims 12-14, 38-39 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi and Serfaty as applied to claims 1, 32 and 55 above, and further in view of Orsic (USP 6147986).

As claims 12-14, 38-39 and 58-59, Kashi and Serfaty do not fully disclose a method of assigning a first remote station address from a first set of addresses in a first zone “cell or sector” and a second remote station address from a second set of addresses in a second zone “cell or sector”; wherein set of addresses form an Internet subnetwork (Fig 1, wherein the base station assigning IP address to mobile when the mobile is located within a cell). Since, both the concept and the advantages of assigning a different address to each remote to different zone having an

Internet subnetwork are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to assign a different address to each remote to different zone having an Internet subnetwork as disclosed by Orsic into the system of Kashi and Serfaty. The motivation would have been to easily locate the remote station in the zones.

8. Claims 20-22, 30-31, 47-48, 53-54 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi and Serfaty as applied to claims 1, 32 and 55 above, and further in view of Choi (USP 6272117).

As claims 20-22, 30-31, 47-48, 53-54 and 64, Kashi and Serfaty do not fully disclose the claimed invention. However, Choi disclose a method of transmitting a control packet for synchronizing the base station and remote station and a guard time for the channels (Fig 7). Since, both the concept and the advantages of using guard time and control packet for synchronization in a wireless system are well known and expected in the art . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to synchronize the base station and remote station by broadcasting a control packet to the mobile as disclosed by Choi into the system of Kashi and Serfaty. The motivation would have been to adjust a clock of the remote station to coincide with the base station.

9. Claims 23, 49 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashi and Serfaty as applied to claims 1, 32 and 55 above, and further in view of Mauney (USP 6484027).

As claims 23, 49 and 65, Kashi does not disclose a system being used in IPMA environment. Mauney discloses a wireless system which includes Internet protocol multiple

access (col. 1, lines 55-57). Since, both the concept and the advantages of using Internet protocol in a wireless system is well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was apply IP into a multiple access system as disclosed by Mauney into the system of Kashi and Serfaty. The motivation would have been to reduce the cost of telephone call.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven HD Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-8848. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy D Vu can be reached on (703) 308-6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.



Steven HD Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2665  
October 15, 2003